THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

New Materials or Traditions Expanded?

Citation for published version:
Klein, A 2016, New Materials or Traditions Expanded? A Response to Eibert Tigchelaar's "Jeremiah's Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition". in *Jeremiah's Scriptures.* JSJSS, Brill, pp. 319-326. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004320253_029

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):
10.1163/9789004320253_029

Link:
Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Published In:
Jeremiah's Scriptures

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

OPEN ACCESS

Download date: 08. May. 2023

New Materials or Traditions Expanded?

A Response to Eibert Tigchelaar's "Jeremiah's Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition"

ANJA KLEIN, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

When I briefly met Eibert Tigchelaar in Göttingen in 2013, I told him about my fascination with the Pseudo-Ezekiel material: In this case, I was convinced that the (so-called) "postbiblical" exegesis in Pseudo-Ezekiel continued the innerbiblical exegesis in the prophetic book. Back then I was confident that the same held true for the Jeremiah Apocryphon, but Eibert just said: "The Jeremiah material is completely different". I was discouraged sufficiently not to have another look at the Jeremiah Apocryphon, but just finished the Pseudo-Ezekiel paper.[1] Therefore, I am quite pleased that Hindy Najman and Konrad Schmid offered me the opportunity to respond to Eibert Tigchelaar's paper on "Jeremiah's Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition", because that has given me a second chance to have a look at the Jeremiah material. I am afraid to say that I could not be put off my initial idea. Rather, I still feel confident that there is a continuing dynamic process of interpretation linking the Qumran Jeremiah material to the prophetic book of Jeremiah, though I have realised that some adjustments are in order.

It is especially my use of the terms "innerbiblical exegesis" and "postbiblical exegesis" in order to distinguish between interpretation within the books that eventually became scripture, and interpretation in the Qumran material, which might be misleading.[2] This terminology suggests two separate groups of texts that should, however, only later be qualified as "biblical" and "non-biblical". And it is only later that these two groups of texts were attributed a different status of authority. Yet if we part with this terminology, the phenomenon behind deserves another glance. What is meant by speaking of "innerbiblical exegesis" or "biblical interpretation"[3] is the observation that the literary growth of the books later qualified as biblical

---

[1] Anja Klein, "Resurrection as Reward for the Righteous: The Vision of the Dry Bones in Pseudo-Ezekiel as External Continuation of the Biblical Vision in Ezek 37:1–14," in *'I Lifted My Eyes and Saw': Reading Dream and Vision Reports in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer and Elizabeth R. Hayes; LHBOTS 584; London: T&T Clark, 2014), 196–220.

[2] It will suffice to say that this use of terminology raised legitimate questions at the conference itself, which helped to sharpen my argument.

[3] Cf. the classic by Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

can be explained by a dynamic exegetical process. Within a book itself, interpretation takes the shape of redaction history. However, research has demonstrated that these exegetical processes work also cross-books in a way that interpretation in one book can be taken up in another work. On this understanding, I would like to demonstrate that the interpretation of Jeremianic material in the Dead Sea Scrolls continues the exegetical discourse that is started in the texts later classified as biblical. The choice of topic in the Qumran material is not an arbitrary one in regard to the scriptural texts, but the Qumran texts actually take up and continue "biblical" interpretation. Thus, it is first and foremost later material of the book of Jeremiah that is taken up, but the Qumran interpretation also draws on motifs from the book that have already undergone a reception history in other books. It is an ongoing process of actualisation and exegesis of Jeremianic material that already starts in the book of Jeremiah itself and continues in the Qumran texts.

My point of departure is the fundamental question, from which Eibert Tigchelaar sets out in his paper on the Qumran material: To what extent do these later texts introduce new materials, or expand traditions that are initiated by the scriptural Jeremiah?[4] This is a great question indeed, but I would like to give an answer by avoiding the opposition suggested in its formulation: These texts produce new materials precisely by interpreting traditions initiated by the scriptural Jeremiah. This brings us back again to the phenomenon of biblical interpretation in terms of redactional activity. While the literary evidence points to the addition of new material by means of insertions, continuations or cross-book references, it has to be assumed that the redactors at work did not intend to add something "new". Rather, their intention was to interpret the meaning of their received text (the *Vorlage*) by adding their interpretation and thus expanding tradition.[5] Hence the implied opposition between new materials and traditions expanded falls short, as "new material" usually implies an interpretation of

[4] Cf. the article by Eibert Tigchelaar in this volume ("Jeremiah's Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition"); in the conference version of the manuscript, the question reads as follows: "A basic question throughout the discussion will be to what extent these later texts introduce new materials, or expand traditions that are initiated by the scriptural Jeremiah […]."

[5] On these hermeneutical assumptions see the contributions by Odil H. Steck, "Prophetische Prophetenauslegung," in *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis* (by Odil H. Steck; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 127–204 (cf. the translation by James D. Nogalski: Odil H. Steck, *The Prophetic Books and Their Theological Witness*. St. Louis/MO: Chalice Press, 2000), and Reinhard G. Kratz, "Innerbiblische Exegese und Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz," in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (by Reinhard G. Kratz; FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 126–56.

existing tradition. Therefore, I want to demonstrate in the following that the continuing interpretation of Jeremianic material in the Qumran texts aims at actualising the prophecy of the book of Jeremiah.

Actually, Eibert Tigchelaar has preordained nicely for my argument and assembled all the evidence required. As far as I can see, he comes up with a number of concerns that connect the Qumran Jeremiah materials with the scriptural Jeremiah. Thereby, he describes "*The growth of Jeremianic traditions*" by distinguishing between those elements that are taken up in the so-called Jeremianic Corpus only ("things Jeremianic in one or more different mss or works") and those that find a broader reception beyond the Corpus. Again, on the understanding that there is an ongoing process of interpretation, this distinction does not seem to be decisive, though it is certainly helpful for the presentation.

According to Tigchelaar, among the first category falls the transformation of the figure of the prophet Jeremiah, which is mainly represented by those texts that are assigned to the Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q383, 4Q384, 4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q388a, 4Q389, 4Q390, 4Q387a).[6] There are two features that attract attention in the representation of the prophet: Firstly, the Apocryphon portrays Jeremiah "in terms like Moses" (Tigchelaar)[7] in that he appears as teacher of Torah, who gives instructions for a pious life in exile; an overall function that Lutz Döring has summed up appropriately under the term "Toraparänese".[8] The posterior narrative frame of the

[6] The edition of this manuscript group has been carried out by Devorah Dimant, taking up the work of John Strugnell (Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts. Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* [DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001], 91–260), with the exception of 4Q384, which was edited by Mark Smith in *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts. Part 2* (ed. Magen Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 137–52. On the history of research and the question of grouping the fragments cf. Dimant, *Parabiblical Texts*, 1–3, 91–116; she has reassessed the material in a recent contribution, cf. Devorah Dimant, "*Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* in Perspective," in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (by Devorah Dimant; FAT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 423–40. While Dimant's work on the manuscript group has found general approval, criticism has been levelled at her affiliation of 4Q390 as being part of the Jeremiah Apocryphon, cf. among others Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 55–56, and Christoph Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* (BZAW 363; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), esp. 398–99.

[7] The portrayal of Jeremiah in terms like Moses has already been observed by George Brooke, "The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception. Le Livre de Jérémie et sa réception* (ed. Adrian H.W. Curtis and Thomas Römer; BEThL CXXVIII; Leuven: University Press, 1997) 183–205, at 191; cf. also Dimant, *Parabiblical Texts*, 105.

[8] Lutz Döring, "Jeremia in Babylonien und Ägypten: Mündliche und schriftliche Toraparänese für Exil und Diaspora nach 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C," in *Frühjuden-*

Apocryphon in 4Q385a f18ia–b, 7–11[9] describes how the prophet Jeremiah exhorts the exiles in Babylon to keep the covenant and the divine statutes. Not only does this job description recall the role of Moses, who serves as the commissioned law-giver *par excellence*, but the likeness is further elaborated by the setting of the Torah exhortation to the Babylonian golah "at the river" (f18ia–b, 7: הנהר[), which evokes the setting of Moses in the plains of Moab at the Jordan (Num 33–36; Deut 1, 29–31).[10] One might even wonder, if this setting pays not also tribute to another scriptural prophet, namely Ezekiel, who addresses the Babylonian golah at the river Chebar in exile (Ezek 1:1: על־נהר־כבר). The scene in the Apocryphon changes, however, to the golah in Egypt in f18ii. Here, the exiled Israelites are likewise summoned to seek God's statutes and keep his commandments, while they shall withstand from idol worship (f18ii, 8–10). This portrayal of Jeremiah as teacher of Torah in a Mosaic cloak is by no means unprecedented, but the author draws on the ongoing interpretation within the book of Jeremiah, where the prophet only in later redactional reworkings appears as a Mosaic teacher of Torah (Jer 7:5–8; 17:19–27; 22:1–5; 34:12–17).[11] The interpretation of the Qumran Apocryphon thus draws on an exegetical trail in the book itself and enlarges the picture of Jeremiah as teacher of Torah.

The second aspect addressed by Tigchelaar is that of Jeremiah and lament. In 4Q385a f18ii, 2, the people ask Jeremiah to intercede on their behalf. However, the prophet does not comply with this request, but he laments over Jerusalem instead (f18ii, 4–5: ירמיה מקונן ◦[קינות ע]ל ירושלים). Tigchelaar rightly points to the ambiguity of this lament, which allows for an interpretation both in terms of underscoring the end of hope and opening up the possibility of a new future. However, the thing that attracts our attention is that the author of the Apocryphon draws on the

---

tum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie: *Mit einem Anhang zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. With the co-operation of Lutz Doering; WUNT I 162; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 50–79, at 59–60, 62.

[9] On the arrangement of the material in the Jeremiah Apocryphon cf. Dimant, *Parabiblical Texts*, 99–100.

[10] Cf. Brooke, "Book," 191; Devorah Dimant, "An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385^{B} = 4Q385 16)," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the IOQS, Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke. With Florentino García Martínez; StDJ 15; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1994), 11–30, at 20, 25ff.

[11] Cf. the study by Christl Meier, *Jeremia als Lehrer der Tora: Soziale Gebote des Deuteronomiums in Fortschreibungen des Jeremiabuches* (FRLANT 196; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2002), esp. 370–72. More general, Doering, "Book," 73, deems the figure of Jeremiah being compatible ("anschlussfähig") for Torah exhortations by developing further biblical tradition.

debate on intercession in the book of Jeremiah. While intercession is part of the prophet's general duties (cf. Jer 21:2, 42:2), God in some texts explicitly forbids Jeremiah to intercede on behalf of his people (Jer 7:16, 11:14, 15:1). Against this background, the passage in 4Q385 f18ii can be understood as a "narrative transformation"[12] of this specific feature that gives an account of how Jeremiah obeys the divine prohibition to intercede. Though there is no consensus yet on the literary historical placement of the ban on intercession, it can be assumed safely that it belongs to later reworkings of the scriptural book.[13] Furthermore, by drawing on the note in 2 Chr 35:25 that tells how Jeremiah utters a lament over Josiah (ויקונן ירמיהו),[14] the Apocryphon integrates yet another Jeremianic text. By combining the ban on intercession with the note of the prophetic lament, the author of the Apocryphon follows up an exegetical trail that starts with later reworkings in the book itself and leads into the literary reception in the books of Chronicles.

A similar exegetical trajectory can be observed with regard to the material that Tigchelaar files under those cases that find a broader reception beyond the Jeremianic Corpus. His first example is the 70-year motif that in Jer 25:11–12 and 29:10 restricts the Babylonian reign onto seventy years, before Babylon shall be judged (25:12) and the golah will return (29:14). This motif is firstly taken up in a number of "biblical" texts.[15] Both 2 Chr 36:21–22 and Ezr 1:1 refer by name to the prophecy of Jeremiah, and the author of 2 Chr 36 relates the exile of the people to the sabbath repose of the land; a concept taken from Lev 26:31–35. This heptadic structure of the seventy years characterises also the exegesis in Dan 9, which elongates the Jeremianic seventy years by interpreting the time span in terms of seventy weeks of seven years each (Dan 9:2, 24–27).[16] Yet the Qumran Apocryphon undertakes a further (heptadic) adjustment by transferring the prolonged time span of seventy year-weeks from Dan 9 into a jubilean periodization of history (4Q387 f2ii, 3–4: עשרה יבלי שנים). However, while the author of Dan 9 operates with a distance between the text

[12] Cf. Doering, „Jeremia", 63–64: „Damit wird eine Vorgabe des biblischen Jer-Buchs narrativ transformiert, derzufolge Gott den Propheten auffordert, nicht für das Volk Fürsprache zu halten."

[13] Cf. Maier, *Jeremia*, 99; Winfried Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (WMANT 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1973), 119.

[14] On the connection to 2 Chron 35:25 cf. Tigchelaar, "Jeremiah's Scriptures"; Dimant, *Parabiblical Texts*, 165 (who further refers to 1 Esdr 1:30).

[15] On the interpretation cf. Reinhard G. Kratz, *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld* (WMANT 63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 261–67; Berner, *Jahre*, 78–84.

[16] Cf. Kratz, *Translatio imperii*, 263–67; Berner, *Jahre*, 22–99, 501.

of Jeremiah (70 years) and his own interpretation, the exegesis in the Apocryphon presupposes the knowledge of the Jeremianic *Vorlage* and offers a simple substitution of the 70-year-period.[17] One might speculate if this is evidence for a greater independence of the *Vorlage* that allowed for more freedom in the interpretation, while at the same time betrays the trust that readers were familiar with the Jeremianic prophecies.

The jubilean periodisation recurs in the fragment 4Q390, though its affiliation with the Jeremiah Apocryphon is disputed.[18] However, its use of periodisation is indication that the work should be counted among the Qumran Jeremianic texts – as does Tigchelaar in his handout. Firstly, in 4Q390 f1, 2, the Jeremianic date of seventy years (שבעים שנה) is applied onto the period of exile, which is characterised as a time of the people transgressing. Yet the work clearly operates with the idea of a prolonged time of exile in terms of jubilees, as in the following section f1, 7–10, the re-emergence of sin in a new generation is dated into the seventh jubilee of the devastation of the land (f1, 7–8: השביעי לחרבן הארץ).[19] The motif of the devastated land draws back again on the prophecy of Jer 25:11, where the desolation of the land during exile is announced (והיתה כל הארץ הזאת לחרבה). While the links to the book of Jeremiah show clearly that the author of 4Q390 is concerned with the Jeremianic concept of exile, the jubilean periodisation is further proof that he was aware of the interpretation of the seventy years in other materials – which for him can only have been a continuation of the "real" Jeremiah. He thus describes post-exilic history by drawing back on the idea of the prolongation of the Jeremianic seventy years as a history of recurring sin.

Finally, Tigchelaar refers to the idea of the new covenant in Jer 31:31–34 that belongs to late redactional reworkings of the prophetic book.[20] This promise deals with the inscription of the Torah onto the heart as a prerequisite for keeping the new covenant with God. The reflection on the necessary human condition for obedience to the covenant has found a wider reception in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Tigchelaar firstly names the fragment 4Q470 ("4QText Concerning Zedekiah"), in which the combination of a

---

[17] Cf. Tigchelaar, "Jeremiah's Scriptures".

[18] Cf on this the literature quoted in FN 6.

[19] Cf. Berner, *Jahre*, 412.

[20] For a long time, a deuteronomistic classification has been assumed (cf. exemplary Winfried Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45* [WMANT 52; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981], 20–28), while recent studies suggest a late post-exilic dating (cf. e.g. Konrad Schmid, *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches: Untersuchungen zur Redaktions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30–33 im Kontext des Buches* [WMANT 72; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996], 301–4, 348, 372–73, and Walter Gross, "Der neue Bund in Jer 31 und die Suche nach übergreifenden Bundeskonzeptionen im Alten Testament," *ThQ* 176 [1996], 259–72, at 262–63).

renewed covenant and Torah occurs, though the text is too fragmentary to draw conclusions on its interpretation. However, the idea of a new covenant has found its way into the Qumran texts above all by way of the exegesis of Jer 31 in Ezek 36 and Ps 51 "with an emphasis on the creation of a new spirit and a right inclination which allows one to observe the commandments".[21] Here, the Rule of the Community has to be mentioned, in which the disposition of the spirit decides on the membership of the individual (1QS V, 21; V, 24; VI, 17; IX, 14, 18, 22).[22] Yet the terminology of the "new covenant" is taken up in the Damascus Document (CD VI:19, VIII:21, XIX:33–34, XX:12) and the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab 2:3–4). In these texts, the Qumran community uses the term of the new covenant as a self-designation, understanding themselves as members of the "new covenant" in opposition to the first covenant that was broken by Israel in the First Temple period.[23] The interpretation in the Qumran texts clearly draws on the preceding history of exegesis in Ezek 36 and Ps 51, in which the idea of the new covenant is interpreted along the lines that the new covenant requires a new spiritual disposition – an image that the Qumran community used in order to constitute their self-understanding as members of the new covenant.

Let me briefly summarise my argument. All four chosen examples furnish proof for my initial suggestion that there is a continuing process of exegesis connecting the book of Jeremiah (and especially its redaction history) with the Qumran material.[24] While examples such as the portrayal of the prophetic figure or the motif of lament go back predominantly to later reworkings in the book of Jeremiah itself, the idea of the seventy years and the concept of the new covenant draw on the reception history of the motifs in other materials. From the perspective of exegetical method, there is no decisive difference between the productive interpretation of the

---

[21] Tigchelaar, "Jeremiah's Scriptures".

[22] The different parts of 1QS show a different understanding of the spirit, though; on this and the exegetical transmission from Jer 31 through Ezek 36 and Ps 51 into the Rule of the Community cf. Anja Klein, "From the 'Right Spirit' to the 'Spirit of Truth': Observations on Psalm 51 and 1QS," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz; FAT II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 171–91.

[23] Cf. on this Bilhah Nitzan, "The Concept of Covenant in Qumran Literature," in *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. David M. Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick and Daniel R. Schwartz; StDJ 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 85–104, esp. 93–98.

[24] Similarly Brooke, "Book," 203: "[…] the range of Jeremiah Apocrypha […] shows how there was a continuing development of Jeremiah traditions in the Second Tempel period. This development may begin in the biblical book itself, but the process of the own book's composition and redaction seems to be reflected in a considerable corpus of apocryphal Jeremiah compositions."

Jeremianic materials in other scriptural books (Ezekiel, Psalms, Daniel, Chronicles) and their interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is only the later canonical process that draws a line between "innerbiblical" and "postbiblical" interpretation. Coming back to Eibert Tigchelaar's initial question, the continuing productive exegesis is evidence of a growth of Jeremianic contents that introduces new materials by expanding prophetic traditions. The exegesis aims at explaining the new thing that was already immanent in the old prophecies, but had to be brought to light in a new interpretation for a new time.

However, with regard to the Qumran Jeremiah Apocryphon, there remains the question, why the interpretation was not written into the book of Jeremiah itself, but constituted a new work. In this case, it has to be assumed that there was an understanding of the prophetic book as being closed. Nevertheless, the prophetic figure of Jeremiah was apparently authoritative enough for his prophecies to be continued. It is especially the idea of Jeremiah as teacher of Torah and his prophecies about exile and restoration that drew later authors to his book, and which made him attractive for the Qumran Community. Being separated from the second temple, Torah obedience can be assumed to have been an important identity marker for the members of the community of the new covenant, while the exegesis of the Jeremianic seventy years allowed them to position themselves in relation to the end of times.